



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

217

**CRM-M-20671-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 11.09.2025**

Lovepreet Singh @ Labhu Sonu

**...Petitioner**

Versus

State of Punjab

**...Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL**

Present: Mr. Vinod Ghai, Senior Advocate assisted by  
Mr. Arnav Ghai, Advocate and  
Mr. Dhruv Trehan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Shukla, Sr.DAG, Punjab.

Mr. A.S.Khosa, Advocate for the complainant.

\*\*\*

**RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)**

**CM-25745-2025 :**

This is an application filed by the complainant for placing on record photographs (Annexure A-1).

Allowed as prayed, subject to all just exceptions.

**Main case :**

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.89 dated 10.08.2024 registered under Sections 333, 115(2) and 351(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 110 of the Act added later on vide DDR No.19 dated 22.08.2024 (Section 109



BNS deleted later on), at Police Station Arniwala, District Fazilka.

2. Brief facts of the prosecution are that Gurdeep Singh @ Kaka, while admitted in the hospital, made a statement that on 03.08.2024 at about 9.00 am, the accused-petitioner called him on phone and stated that the complainant was defaming him in the village for having taken a loan from him. After exchange of hot words on phone, the petitioner entered the house of the complainant and caused him injuries with *kappa* and *dang*. On raising alarm, he fled from there. It was also alleged that the petitioner owed Rs.2200/- to the complainant.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no concern with the said offence. The FIR was registered after a delay of seven days with oblique motives and only a wooden stick was recovered from the house of the petitioner. He further contends that even the version of the complainant is unbelievable as in his supplementary statement he alleged that the petitioner had caused injuries with two weapons – after causing two *kappa* blows, he threw it and picked a *dang* to cause other injuries. The nature of injuries is also arguable point in the present case. The petitioner is behind bars since 20.08.2024. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case. The investigation in the case is complete and final report under Section 193 BNSS has since been submitted. He further submits that the trial will take a long time to conclude, as till date no prosecution witness has been examined and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition



deserves to be allowed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned State counsel, who has appeared on advance notice of the petition, has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. He has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. However, he has not controverted the fact that petitioner is not involved in any other case.

6. Learned counsel for the complainant has argued that the petitioner has caused grievous injuries to the complainant and the complainant has not yet recovered from the injuries. To lend support to his contention, he has drawn attention of this Court to the photographs of the complainant placed on record (Annexure A-1). Learned counsel for the complainant submits that the petitioner does not deserve the relief of bail.

7. In rebuttal, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that there is no medical report by any doctor to support Annexure A-1 placed on record by the complainant and as such, it cannot be looked into. He has further submitted that the claimant was first examined on 03.08.2024 at Civil Hospital, Fazilka and as per Annexure P-11, he was admitted in the Civil Hospital Fazilka on the same day and he left on his own without the advice of the Doctor on 06.08.2024. He further argued that as per Annexure P-10, he was admitted in Dayanand Medical College and Hospital Ludhiana on 16.08.2024 and he again got himself discharged from the hospital on 27.08.2024 against medical advise. It has been specifically recorded in the discharge summary (Annexure P-10) that the condition of the patient



improved gradually and he was shifted to ward. Patient still required further treatment and hospital care but he wanted to be discharged, as such, was discharged against medical advise. He argued that the present medical condition, if any, is due to the negligence of the complainant himself and as per the first MLR, none of the injuries was serious in nature.

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than one year; investigation is complete; challan stands presented, and the fact that trial may take a long time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by detaining him in further custody. Keeping the petitioner in further detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

9. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11.09.2025  
'gian'

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)  
JUDGE

|                             |          |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| Whether Speaking / Reasoned | Yes / No |
| Whether Reportable          | Yes / No |